

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 11-14, 16-21, 24-30 are currently pending in the Application. Claims 1, 11, and 16 are in independent format. Applicant has cancelled claims 7-10, 15, and 22-23, and added claims 28-30, herein.

The present Response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejections raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicant does not concede any of the Examiner's comments not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

II. Responses to Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 7-10, 11-14, and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0043065 ("Bekanich") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,772 ("Binding"). The Examiner also rejected claims 15, 20, 22, 24, and 26 under section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Bekanich in view of Binding as applied to claims 1, 7, 11, and 16 and further in view of EP1028578 ("Henderson").

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness over a combination of references, the combination must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143; *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). In this case, the combination of Bekanich, Binding, and Henderson does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of any of independent claims 1, 11, or 16. Accordingly, the combination also fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of any of dependent claims 2-6, 12-14, 17-21, and 24-30.

In light of the amendments made herein, each of Applicant's independent claims now include recitations directed to a second client station, such as a mobile station or a personal computer, that can display one or more records of calls including the categorization of calls. In particular, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the recitation "displaying on a second client station one or more records of calls including the categorization of each call." Applicant has also amended independent claim 11 to include the recitation "wherein the system further comprises a second client station, the second client station comprising a display and program logic executable to present on the display one or more records of calls including the categorization of each call." Independent claim 16 also includes a similar recitation, namely that a second client station "comprises a display and program logic executable to present on the display one or more records of calls and the categorization of each call."

In contrast to each of Applicant's independent claims, none of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest a second client station that can display one or more records of calls including the categorization of calls. Moreover, the Examiner has not cited any of these references for such a proposition.

For example, Bekanich fails to teach or suggest a second client station that can display one or more records of calls including the categorization of calls. At best, Bekanich teaches a "wireless communication device which communicates and synchronizes information wired or wirelessly between a computer and or [sic] server for updating, displaying and storage purposes." Bekanich ¶¶ [0026; 0039]. Bekanich, however, provides no teaching or disclosure on what "information" may be synchronized, nor does Bekanich provide any teaching or suggestion that "a computer and or [sic] server" may be used to display one or more records of calls including the categorization of calls. Instead, Bekanich seems to be only directed "to

provid[ing] a visual display to the operator on the wireless communication device," not on a second client station. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ [0026; 0039].

Both Binding and Henderson fail to cure the deficiencies of Bekanich. Binding provides no disclosure directed to displaying records of calls, much less to displaying records of calls that include categorizations of calls. Henderson discloses, at best:

When a user on his PC 2 using a web browser 9 goes to the Call-Manager URL (which activates a CGI script), the web-server CGI 10 retrieves the users call log information, formats it into a web page and send it to the user's browser 9, which is displayed on the user's PC.

Henderson ¶ [0025]. Henderson, however, provides no teaching or suggestion that a user's "call log information" can include "categorizations of calls," which is a significant aspect of each of Applicant's claimed embodiments. Moreover, Henderson appears to only be directed to obtaining information from incoming telephone calls, "for remotely accessing a user's caller identification system," for example. *Id.* ¶¶ [0001]-[0003]. Applicant therefore submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 16 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established the requisite *prima facie* case of obviousness of Applicant's independent claims 1, 11, and 16, for the reasons discussed above. Applicant points out that claims 2-6, 12-14, 17-21, and 24-27 depend from and include all of the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, Applicant's dependent claims distinguish over the cited references for the same reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 16. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established the requisite *prima facie* case of obviousness of the pending dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims. If the Examiner would like to discuss any aspect of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 312-913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP



Date: May 8, 2006

By:

Eric R. Moran
Reg. No. 50,967